



REVAMPING EVALUATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Rajesh Devi

Research Scholar (JRF), Deptt. of Education, M.D.U, Rohtak.

ABSTRACT

“Revamp means to change, in order to improve it.”

Why revamping Evaluation in Teacher Education required? Because teaching matter in students over all development in personal and professional growth. Without capable and quality teachers no educational reform effects can possible succeed. Teachers play a vital role in helping people to develop their talents and fulfill their potential for personal growth and well-being. The success of a student depends most of all on quality of the teacher. The Core of education is teaching and learning and teaching learning connection works when we have effective teachers working with every student every day. In the fast changing world of the early 21st century public education is also changing. As part of the changes the role of schools and education will also be different both in the educational system and in the society. Together with them the role of teachers will also be change. This article attempts to examine the revamping Evaluation in teacher Education present scenario of teacher education and quality of teachers. India has one of the largest systems of teacher education in the world. Education of teachers not only facilitates improvement of school education by preparing competent, committed and professionally well qualified teachers who can meet the demand of the system, but also functions as a bridge between schooling and higher education. The role of teacher education as a process of nation building is universally recognized. But teacher education in India, because of its history and also due to various factors beyond its control, has by and large been confined to school education only. Evidently the quality of education is a direct consequence and outcome of the quality of teachers and teacher education system. Teachers serve education, which is an effective instrument of man making. Without high quality evaluation system, we cannot know if we have high quality teachers (Stronge & Tucker, 2003, p. 3). Teacher evaluation is, first about documenting the quality of teacher performance; then its focus shifts to helping teachers improve their performance as well as holding them accountability of their work.

Objective: objective of this study to examine the revamping Evaluation in teacher Education in present scenario of teacher education and quality of teachers because without capable and quality teacher no educational goals archived.

Methodology: Descriptive Study

Revamping Teacher Education Evaluation

Evaluation is based on predetermined criteria; observation based, and involves data collection often with the use of an evaluation instrument (Nolan & Hoover, 2011). Effective teacher evaluation is essential for verifying and maintaining high quality instruction and student learning, ensuring that goals and objectives are achieved, providing a focus for instructional improvement, and holding educators accountable for their instruction. Current evaluation measures are fraught with problems in both design and implementation, and a more effective evaluation system is needed (Weingarten, 2010). Due to the importance placed on teacher quality, an effective evaluation model is imperative. Our goals are two-fold: to examine current and past practice and to use our findings to inform an improvement strategy. A literature review provided the necessary and appropriate insight for determining effective and ineffective evaluation practices. Such insight led to the development of an evaluation model. The model can be used to advance teacher effectiveness in the classroom or as a guide to self-evaluation.

Current Teaching Evaluation Practices

Teacher evaluation is mandated in most educational jurisdictions. Post-secondary, evaluation processes have focused more on accountability-based political agendas rather than on practices meant to improve teaching and learning (Holland, 2005). The Widget Effect laid the issue of educational problems squarely on the shoulders of poor evaluation strategies that fail to provide meaningful information, are based on binary rating scales, and do little to discriminate exemplary teaching from poor teaching. The increased focus on teacher evaluation has elevated to post-secondary where the process becomes even more complex. Often the problem is not that post-secondary staffs members are Educational authorities have significant leeway in how evaluations are conducted and how frequently evaluations will be performed (Bouchamma, 2005; Kennedy, 2008; Santiago & Benavides, 2009).

Why Revamping Required?

Previous evaluation systems were inadequate. They identified nearly all teachers simply as satisfactory or not, without offering any useful feedback or direction to teachers on how they can improve. New evaluation tools, notably improvements in classroom observations and the ability to connect teachers to student achievement, have been developed that are more accurate measures of teacher and school performance. In response, federal programs such as Race to the Top and NCLB waivers provided incentives to states to redesign their evaluation systems.

Steps for evaluation process:

1. A differentiated evaluation approach based on the teacher's level of development.
2. A collaborative approach that considers the teacher's goals, progress towards achieving those goals, and the implications of that progress.
3. Multiple observations by more than one individual.
4. Formative as well as summative evaluation, with greater determination on the formative approach.
5. A focus on school goals as well as individual goals.
6. Transparent evaluation policies those are clearly articulated and defined.
7. Stakeholder input into the design of new evaluation systems has been important to gaining broad-based support.
8. Most state evaluations include measures on how teachers impact their students' achievement.
9. Improvements in classroom observations are a more accurate measure of instructional quality than previous classroom observation methods. They also provide valuable feedback to help teachers improve their own practice.
10. Most states evaluate teachers on multiple measures to provide a more complete and accurate picture of a teacher's effectiveness. No state evaluates teachers on test scores alone.
11. Most states are primarily focused on using evaluation for the purpose of raising teacher performance but also use the results to inform personnel decisions.
12. Local school districts need flexibility in designing and implementing teacher evaluation systems so they are aligned to the needs of the district. But some also need strong support and resources from their state

Limitations in Teaching Evaluation process:

- The evaluation system is out of date and has not changed in decades.
- The system is not comprehensive enough to have any real impact.

- The criteria for ratings were inadequately defined and inconsistently interpreted.
- Although a district-wide process is in place, it does not yield any meaningful feedback for teachers.

Some noted that their processes were too summative, failing to provide any substantial emphasis on instructional improvement, while others said that evaluation procedures were either too vague or too generic to be of any substantive use. Some administrators saw this lack of perceived effectiveness of their present teacher evaluation processes as the cause for teacher evaluation having no real impact on individual teacher behavior. And yet, when the evaluation tools were designed using best practice and the process was more formative than summative, teacher unions became uncomfortable and resisted this process too.

Teacher Evaluation Benefits

As study data demonstrate, school administrators dedicate a considerable portion of their time to implement the district required teacher evaluation process even though they generally understand that this teacher evaluation process has a limited direct impact on improving an individual's teaching and subsequent student learning. However, the question remains whether or not building level administrators subsequent any other benefits concerned with the teacher evaluation process. Administrators identified four areas of benefit associated with teacher evaluation, some listing more than one benefit. The most frequently reported benefit of teacher evaluation was its usefulness in aligning individual teacher's personal goal setting with annual district goals. The inclusion of goal setting components in the teacher evaluation process helped administrators to work with faculty members to develop well-aligned individual annual goals that often included action plans. Another benefit of the goal setting process was that it contributed to richer discussions between the evaluator and teacher, particularly with tenured faculty, and that as a result of this discussion personal staff development plans were often created. Others noted the value of goal setting in assisting non-tenured teachers to be more reflective about their teaching.

Conclusion

The quality of education depends upon the quality of the teachers in the classroom (Koops& Winsor, 2005; Peterson, 2004). As such, evaluation of teachers is necessary to promote professional excellence by providing a basis to review teachers' performance (Koops& Winsor, 2005). Evaluation can be one of the most effective tools to improve the quality of instruction in schools because it promotes instructional improvement and increased student learning (Koops& Winsor, 2005); yet the evaluation system still in use in most schools falls short of this goal. Improvements in instruction will translate into improved student learning, which ultimately is the intended outcome of teacher evaluation. According to Marzano (2012), an effective teaching evaluation system is one that is comprehensive and specific, includes a developmental scale, and acknowledges and rewards teachers' growth. The purpose of teacher evaluation should not only be to measure teacher growth but also to promote teacher development (Marzano, 2012; Mielke& Frontier, 2012).

REFERENCES

1. Balan, R.M., Manko, T.P., & Phillips, K.F. (2011). Instructional improvement through professional development. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 5 (2), 1-18.
2. Bouchamma, Y. (2005). Evaluating teaching personnel: Which model of supervision do Canadian teachers prefer? *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 18(4), 289-309. doi: 10.1007/s11092-007-9025-8
3. Buller, J. L. (2012). *Best practices in faculty evaluation: A practical guide for academic leaders*. San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.
4. Burnett, A., Cushing, E., & Bivona, L. (2012). Use of multiple measures for performance based compensation. Retrieved from [http://0-ecr.ed.gov.opac.acc.msmc.edu/Chisholm,M.,Hayes.E.J.,LaBrecque,S.,&Smith,D.\(2011\).The%20role%20of%20faculty%20evaluation%20in%20transformative%20change.%20The%20Journal%20of%20Faculty%20Development,%2025\(1\),%2036-42.%20Retrieved%20from%20http://search.proquest.com/docview/1095350621?accountid=35812](http://0-ecr.ed.gov.opac.acc.msmc.edu/Chisholm,M.,Hayes.E.J.,LaBrecque,S.,&Smith,D.(2011).The%20role%20of%20faculty%20evaluation%20in%20transformative%20change.%20The%20Journal%20of%20Faculty%20Development,%2025(1),%2036-42.%20Retrieved%20from%20http://search.proquest.com/docview/1095350621?accountid=35812)
5. Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument*. (2013 ed.). Retrieved from <http://danielsongroup.org/framework/>
6. Danielson, C. (2012). Developing effective teacher evaluation systems: conversation with Charlotte Danielson. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/Teacher-Evaluation-Systems>
7. Danielson, C. (1997). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
8. Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: To enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
9. Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). *Creating a comprehensive system for evaluating and supporting effective teaching*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education.
10. Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E. H., & Rothstein, J. (2011). *Getting teacher evaluation right: A background paper for policy-makers*. American Education Research Association. Retrieved from <http://www.njea.org/njeamedia/pdf/GettingTeacherEvaluationRight.pdf?1341989791440>
11. Darling-Hammond, L., Amrein-Beardsley, A., Haertel, E. H., & Rothstein, J. (2014). *Evaluating teacher evaluation*. Phi Delta Kappan. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/03/01/kappan_hammond.html
12. Evans, M. D. D., & McNelis, P. D. (2000). Student evaluations and the assessment of teaching: What can we learn from the data? Retrieved from http://faculty.georgetown.edu/evansm1/wpapers_files/evalstudy.pdf
13. Fioriglio, T. (2012). *New Pennsylvania teacher evaluation process coming in 2013*. The TimesHerald. Retrieved from <http://www.timesherald.com/article/20120722/NEWS01/120729899/new-pennsylvaniateacher-evaluation-process-coming-in-2013>